

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

CURTIS SCOTT,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 21-cv-11145  
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

LEROY SOLES, *et al.*,

Defendants.

/

---

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S**  
**MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION (ECF No. 10)**

In March 2016, a jury in this Court convicted Plaintiff Curtis Scott of one count of carjacking in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 2119(1) and (2), one count of using or carrying a firearm during and in relation to a crime of violence in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 924(c) and (2), and one count of making a false statement or representation to a department or agency of the United States in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1001. (*See* Verdict Form, ECF No. 91 in E.D. Mich. Case No. 14-cr-20780.)

On May 10, 2021, Scott filed this civil action against the criminal defense attorneys who represented him at trial, Leroy Soles and the Federal Defenders Office. (*See* Compl., ECF No. 1.) In his Complaint, Scott brought a legal malpractice claim against the Defendants. (*See id.*) The Court dismissed the Complaint on October 25, 2021, because Scott had failed to establish that this Court

had subject-matter jurisdiction over his state-law malpractice claim. (*See* Order, ECF No. 9.)

Scott has now filed a motion for reconsideration. (*See* Mot., ECF No. 10.) In the motion, Scott argues that the Court has subject-matter jurisdiction under “28 U.S.C. 1332” because he seeks “over \$75 thousand” in damages. (*Id.*, PageID.26.) But as the Court previously explained to Scott, a claim for damages in an amount over \$75,000 is just one component of the Court’s diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. (*See* Order to Show Cause, ECF No. 4, PageID.13.) Indeed, Scott must also show that “he and the Defendants are citizens of different states.” (*Id.*) Scott has still failed to do so. Thus, because Scott’s motion for reconsideration does not address the basis of the Court’s dismissal, and because Scott has still not shown that the Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over his claim, Scott’s motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 10) is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: February 14, 2022	<u>s/Matthew F. Leitman</u> MATTHEW F. LEITMAN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
--------------------------	---

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on February 14, 2022, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Ryan  
Case Manager  
(313) 234-5126